



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,127	11/14/2001	Gyung-Yun Chwa	678-713 (P9688)	6212

28249 7590 01/12/2006

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD.
UNIONDALE, NY 11553

EXAMINER

BAYERL, RAYMOND J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/993,127	Applicant(s) CHWA, GYUNG-YUN	
	Examiner Raymond J. Bayerl	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 9 - 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 9 - 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2173

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In reciting "the method of claim 8", applicant refers to a canceled claim. It is presumed to expedite prosecution that applicant had intended claim 12 as the parent claim, since it exhibits the antecedent basis needed.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 6, 9 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smethers ("Smethers"; US #6,560,640 B2) in view of Mintz ("Mintz"; US #6,250,930 B1).

As per independent claim 6, Smethers discloses a system that allows a user to bookmark web pages on a handheld device. The user programs the bookmarks manually and identifies a bookmark with a specific number. Thus, Smethers teaches "selecting one of a plurality of bookmarks, wherein each bookmark includes a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) field for saving an address of an Internet resource" (col. 3 lines 1-6 & col. 3 lines 34-44).

When a Smethers user has launched a bookmark, the bookmark has a identifier, the identifier is a button key, and when the key is pressed, it is used to point to the stored URL, which launches a document or file to be displayed to the browser.

The difference between the claims and Smethers is that the claim recites the use of "a browser ID field for saving a browser ID used to select a corresponding browser from the plurality of browsers" and "launching a browser of the plurality of browsers corresponding to the browser ID, the launched browser interpreting a URL of the selected bookmark, and accessing the Internet resource". Smethers has a single implied browser that is referenced by such URL names as <http://www.uplanet.com/stocks.html> (see fig 4), but does not **explicitly** teach that a "plurality of browsers" may be referenced through such stored bookmark information.

However, Mintz teaches a system for allowing a user to view web-browsing information on the Internet on a single screen similar to that of Smethers. In addition, Mintz discloses "launching a browser of the plurality of browsers corresponding to the browser ID, the launched browser interpreting a URL of the selected bookmark, and accessing the Internet resource" (col. 7 lines 58-65): Mintz teaches the launching of multiple browsers that can be incorporated into a memo, message, survey, questionnaire or direct mail piece, all of which can be simultaneously displayed on a single screen. Currently, the e-Logic system permits about fifteen independent browsers to be simultaneously (rather than sequentially) displayed on a single screen (while about fifty browsers can be simultaneously displayed on multiple screens). This allows for the simultaneous search, viewing and transmittal of multiple search engines, multiple web sites, bookmarks or any combination thereof.

Mintz's multiple browsers can present a variety of forms of information—A variety of multimedia file formats may be embedded in an e-Logic mail message, these

Art Unit: 2173

including Microsfot Word documents (*.doc), Microsoft Excel spreadsheets (*.xls), Microsoft Excel worksheets (*.xlw) and Powerpoint presentations (*.ppt) (col 5, lines 24 – 52). This means that the bookmarks that are used in Mintz will have to carry a “browser ID of a selected bookmark” in able to cause the content referenced to be properly presented. Typically, and as is suggested by Mintz, the file extension (e.g., (*.doc), (*.xls)) will signify to the rendering device just which “browser” should be employed. In addition, to provide the correct reference to the plural browsers that are launched in Mintz, a form of “browser ID” must also be employed, to direct the access to its proper corresponding rendering.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the launching of a browser as taught by Smethers to include a launch from a plurality of browsers as in Mintz, in order to obtain a system that allows the user to bookmark information of URL web pages and have a plurality of browsers to choose from in producing a more accurate and useful result. Motivation lies at least in Smethers, where the rendering of a bookmark is intended to give a user a useful result, and in the case of content encoded in a non-standard html format (or, indeed, just to present plural browsers as in Mintz), a reference in the stored bookmark information needs to specify the correct destination for the multimedia content that is accessed from the Internet.

As per claim 9, where “the browser ID field is 8 bits”, and claim 10, in which “the URL field is 64 bits”, it was notoriously well known in the art that a browser ID and Uniform Resource Locator field must contain some certain number of bits, and also that

it was notoriously well known to employ power of two bit-multiples, such as 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, etc. Please note, for example, that Smethers states that a Bookmark ID is preferably two bytes in size (col. 12 line 42; this meaning 16 bits).

The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the ubiquity of power of two bit-multiples for encoding items in storage, and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the bit size of Smethers/Mintz to such standard values as are claimed. This permits the binary-operating computer system an optimum efficiency in handling the data for bookmarks as it is accessed.

As per claim 11, which recites, "the URL field is a string with null termination", it was also notoriously well known to one of the ordinary skill in the art that a URL field is a string with null termination, since the data of a URL is of a "string" format, and when it ends, a "null" is used as contrast to the main portion of the "string".

The examiner further takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that a "URL field" must end with a termination after a set of characters. It is important for strings to end with a termination, which can be any type of termination character, i.e. null sign, pound sign, or asterisk symbol, for the logic encoded in an information handling system, so that system is able to determine the ending of the set of characters in a string field. It would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the URL string of Smethers/Mintz to include a null character for a termination character, so that the information would be properly delimited for the

purposes of storage and access in the bookmark system disclosed by both Smethers and Mintz.

Independent claim 12 focuses on “A bookmark frame generating method” of the kind that uses “a bookmark manager” to implement “a bookmark” via a “bookmark file” that contains the “browser” “ID” and “URL” as has been discussed above in reference to claim 6. However, the bookmarks of Smethers are authored manually by a user, and in Mintz, an entire e-Logic Authoring and Editing Engine is provided for this purpose (col 5, line 24 – col 6, line 7), so a “bookmark manager” that creates a “bookmark file” was also known in such art as Smethers and Mintz. In particular, Mintz suggests that a “selected browser” for an “Internet resource having the unique protocol” is needed, as in the case of different formats of file content, or indeed, to support plural browsers as in Mintz.

As per claim 13, Smethers in view of Mintz discloses the step of “inputting a bookmark name in the assigned bookmark file after the URL inputting step” (as at Smethers, col. 12 lines 5-10)—the Smethers system, for example, will use a number as a shorthand reference to a bookmark.

The “bookmark file” that results in the Smethers/Mintz combination results in “saving a bookmark frame including the URL of the Internet resource having the unique protocol...and the allocated ID corresponding to the selected browser”, as in claim 15.

Independent claim 14 reiterates the claim 6 function, when its “program” will “launch the particular browser according to the browser ID” that is designated by the use of a “bookmark frame” that has “a URL field corresponding in 1:1 relation to the browser ID field”. However, and as has been noted above, the Smethers system of

bookmark retention, where a "URL field" is retained to "access the Internet according to the URL", would have obviously benefited from the kind of "browser ID"-specific functionality that is suggested by Mintz.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1 December 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At page 5, applicant argues that "Smethers teaches a 'compact bookmark identifier and not including a universal resource locator for the selected bookmark page'", "which clearly teaches away from the present invention". However, the Smethers system works with stored bookmark information, even if in the particular example the client device works across a network to access that information, and this is enough to read on applicant's claims. In addition, Mintz has the storage of bookmarks with both URLs and browser IDs which further reads upon the claimed invention.

At pages 5 – 6, applicant begins by summarizing the identical disclosure of Mintz, and then submits, "Regarding the Examiner's statement in Paragraph 11 of the Advisory Action dated November 14, 2005, that 'the claim does not actually require separate and disjoint URL, [sic] browser ID fields' it is respectfully submitted that as further proof of the patentability of the claims of the present invention," followed by a summary of the recitations of the independent claims, and that "These recitations are neither taught nor suggested by Smethers or Mintz or the combination thereof". However, this does not provide a substantial answer to the difficulty in allowing a claim in which a "URL" and a "browser ID" are held together in storage to implement a "bookmark". Mintz supports a variety of plural bookmarks, and has at least two aspects that read upon the claimed

Art Unit: 2173

invention: the use of plural filename extensions to call different rendering interfaces applies a "browser ID" on a per "URL" basis, and the mere existence of plural Mintz browsers in a single interface means that an "ID" of some sort is inherently required, to keep the outputs straight, from one "bookmark" to another.


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

During a new and updating search, the Examiner noted the relevance of Bates et al. (US #6,961,751 B1), in teaching a bookmarking arrangement for directing plural sources to a browser.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl whose telephone number is (571) 272-4045. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Th from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM ET.

8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (571) 272-4048. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (571) 273-8300.

9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

9 January 2006